

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Applied Mathematics Letters 19 (2006) 706–711

**Applied  
Mathematics  
Letters**
[www.elsevier.com/locate/aml](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/aml)

# Global existence of solutions for a fourth-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation<sup>☆</sup>

Cuihua Guo<sup>\*</sup>, Shangbin Cui*Institute of Mathematics, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510275, PR China*

Received 17 May 2004; received in revised form 4 September 2005; accepted 11 October 2005

## Abstract

In this work we study the Cauchy problem of a fourth-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation which arises from certain physical applications. We consider only the cases  $n = 1, 2, 3$ . Local existence of solutions for initial data belonging to Sobolev spaces with index greater than  $n/2$  is established by using the standard contraction mapping argument. The main topic is proving that the solution is global if either the exponent of the nonlinear term is sub-critical or it is critical or super-critical but the initial data are small. This result extends the corresponding result of Fibich et al. obtained in 2002 to the super-critical case and to a more general equation. The analysis is based on applications of conservation laws for this equation.

© 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Nonlinear Schrödinger equation; Fourth order; Initial value problem; Global existence

## 1. Introduction

In this work we study the Cauchy problem of the following fourth-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation:

$$i\varphi_t + \lambda \Delta \varphi + \mu \Delta^2 \varphi + f(|\varphi|^2)\varphi = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are real numbers,  $\mu \neq 0$ , and  $f$  is a given real-valued nonlinear function.

When  $\mu = 0$  and  $\lambda \neq 0$ , Eq. (1.1) is the nonlinear Schrödinger equation which arises in many scientific fields such as quantum mechanics, nonlinear optics, and plasma physics, and has been intensively studied by many authors. When  $\lambda = 0$ ,  $\mu \neq 0$  and  $f(s) = s^\sigma$  ( $\sigma \geq 1$ ), Eq. (1.1) reduces to the *biharmonic* nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\varphi_t + \mu \Delta^2 \varphi + |\varphi|^{2\sigma} \varphi = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

which was studied by Ivanov and Kosevich [1] and Turitsyn [2] in the context of the stability of solitons in magnetic materials where the effective quasi-particle mass becomes infinite. The case where both the second-order dispersion

<sup>☆</sup> Project supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China. Grant number: 10171112.

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [gchzjq@yahoo.com.cn](mailto:gchzjq@yahoo.com.cn) (C. Guo), [cuisb3@yahoo.com.cn](mailto:cuisb3@yahoo.com.cn) (S. Cui).

term  $\lambda \Delta \varphi$  ( $\lambda \neq 0$ ) and the fourth-order dispersion term  $\mu \Delta^2 \varphi$  ( $\mu \neq 0$ ) exist was considered by Karpman and Shagalov ([3] and the references therein) and Fibich et al. [4], who studied the equation

$$i\varphi_t + \lambda \Delta \varphi + \mu \Delta^2 \varphi + \nu |\varphi|^{2\sigma} \varphi = 0 \quad (1.3)$$

with  $\lambda = 1$ ,  $\mu \neq 0$ , and  $\nu = 1$ . Karpman and Shagalov studied the so-called waveguide solutions and their stability, while Fibich et al. studied solutions of the general Cauchy problem. The main results of Fibich et al. [4] can be summarized as follows: Let  $\lambda = 1$  and  $\nu = 1$ . Then each of the following three conditions is sufficient for global existence of solutions of the Cauchy problem of (1.3): (i)  $\mu > 0$ ; (ii)  $\mu < 0$  and  $\sigma n < 4$ ; (iii)  $\mu < 0$ ,  $\sigma n = 4$ , and  $\|\varphi_0\|_{H^2(R^n)}^2 < N_c^B$ , where  $\varphi_0$  is the initial value of  $\varphi$ , and  $N_c^B$  is a positive number depending only on the dimension  $n$ . The case  $\sigma n > 4$  is open.

In this work we study the global existence of solutions for the Cauchy problem of the more general nonlinear Schrödinger equation (1.1). We want to extend the results of [4] stated above. In particular, we want to establish global existence for the case  $\sigma n > 4$  for small initial value problems. Later on we shall use the notation  $\varphi_0$  to denote the initial value of the unknown function  $\varphi$ , i.e.,  $\varphi_0(x) = \varphi(x, 0)$  for all  $x \in R^n$ .

The main results of this work are as follows:

**Theorem 1.1** (For General Initial Value). *Let  $n = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\mu \neq 0$ . Let  $k$  be an integer,  $k \geq 2$ . Suppose  $f \in C^{k+1}(R_+; R)$ , and there exist a positive constant  $c_0$  and an exponent  $0 \leq \sigma < \frac{4}{n}$  such that*

$$\mu f(s) \geq -c_0(1+s)^\sigma \quad \text{for } s \geq 0. \quad (1.4)$$

*Then for any  $\varphi_0 \in H^k(R^n)$ , the initial value problem of (1.1) has a unique global solution  $\varphi$  in the class*

$$C(R; H^k(R^n)) \cap C^1(R; H^{k-2}(R^n)). \quad (1.5)$$

**Theorem 1.2** (For Small Initial Value). *Let  $n = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\mu \neq 0$ . Let  $k$  be an integer,  $k \geq 2$ . Suppose  $f \in C^{k+1}(R_+; R)$ . Then there exists a constant  $c^* > 0$  such that for any  $\varphi_0 \in H^k(R^n)$  satisfying  $\|\varphi_0\|_{2,2} \leq c^*$ , the initial value problem of (1.1) has a unique global solution  $\varphi$  in the class (1.5).*

Applying these results to the Eq. (1.3) we immediately get the following result:

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $n = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\mu \neq 0$ . Let  $\sigma$  be a nonnegative integer. Assume that  $\varphi_0 \in H^k(R^n)$  for some integer  $k \geq 2$ . Then each of the following three conditions is sufficient for global existence of solutions to the initial value problem of the Eq. (1.3) in the class (1.5):*

- (1)  $\mu\nu > 0$ ;
- (2)  $\mu\nu < 0$ , and  $0 \leq \sigma < \frac{4}{n}$ ;
- (3)  $\mu\nu < 0$ ,  $\sigma \geq \frac{4}{n}$ , and  $\|\varphi_0\|_{2,2} \leq c^*$ , where  $c^*$  is a positive constant (see Lemma 3.3).

**Remark 1.** The condition that  $\sigma$  is a nonnegative integer in the last result is imposed to ensure that the function  $s \rightarrow s^\sigma$  (for  $s \geq 0$ ) is sufficiently smooth at  $s = 0$ . This condition can be removed by using an approximation argument. However, due to limitations of space, we shall not do this job.

**Remark 2.** We conjecture that, like in the nonlinear Schrödinger equation case, there is an optimal constant for the critical value  $c^*$  appearing in Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, and this optimal constant should have relations with the ground state of the fourth-order Schrödinger equation and some minimizer of certain Sobolev inequalities (cf. [4]). To prove this conjecture needs much more work; we leave it for the future.

In Section 2 we establish local existence. In Section 3 we give the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

## 2. Local existence of solutions

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $k$  be an integer greater than  $\frac{n}{2}$ . Let  $f$  be a real-valued function defined on  $R_+ = [0, \infty)$ . Suppose  $f \in C^k(R_+; R)$ . Then for any  $u \in H^k(R^n)$  we have  $f(|u|^2)u \in H^k(R^n)$ , and there exists  $\omega_1 \in C(R_+; R_+)$  such that for any  $u \in H^k(R^n)$ ,*

$$\|f(|u|^2)u\|_{k,2} \leq \omega_1(\|u\|_{k,2})\|u\|_{k,2}. \quad (2.1)$$

Suppose further  $f \in C^{k+1}(R_+; R)$ . Then there exists  $\omega_2 \in C(R_+; R_+)$  such that for any  $u_1, u_2 \in H^k(R^n)$ ,

$$\|f(|u_1|^2)u_1 - f(|u_2|^2)u_2\|_{k,2} \leq \omega_2(\|u_1\|_{k,2} + \|u_2\|_{k,2})\|u_1 - u_2\|_{k,2}, \quad (2.2)$$

and there exists  $\omega_3 \in C(R_+; R_+)$  such that for any  $u \in H^{k+1}(R^n)$ ,

$$\|f(|u|^2)u\|_{k+1,2} \leq \omega_3(\|u\|_{k,2})\|u\|_{k+1,2}. \quad (2.3)$$

The proof can be found in the book of Mizohata [5], p. 355.

As is well known, the initial value problem of Eq. (1.1) is equivalent to the following integral equation:

$$\varphi(\cdot, t) = W(t)\varphi_0 + i \int_0^t W(t-s)f(|\varphi(\cdot, s)|^2)\varphi(\cdot, s)ds, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $W(t)$  ( $t \in R$ ) is the operator on  $S'(R^n)$  defined by

$$W(t)u = F^{-1}(e^{i(\mu|\xi|^4 t - \lambda|\xi|^2 t)} F(u)) \quad \text{for } u \in S'(R^n), \quad (2.5)$$

where  $F$  and  $F^{-1}$  denote the Fourier and inverse Fourier transformations over  $R^n$ , respectively. By the Plancherel identity, it is clear that for any  $t \in R$  and any real  $s$ ,  $W(t)$  is a unitary operator when restricted to  $H^s(R^n)$ , i.e., the following identity holds:

$$\|W(t)u\|_{s,2} = \|u\|_2 \quad \text{for } u \in H^s(R^n). \quad (2.6)$$

**Theorem 2.2.** Let  $k$  be an integer greater than  $\frac{n}{2}$ . Suppose  $f \in C^{k+1}(R_+; R)$ . Then for any  $\varphi_0 \in H^k(R^n)$ , there exists  $T > 0$  such that the initial value problem of Eq. (1.1) has a unique solution  $\varphi = \varphi(x, t)$  on  $R^n \times [-T, T]$ , belonging to the class

$$C([-T, T]; H^k(R^n)) \cap C^1([-T, T]; H^{k-4}(R^n)). \quad (2.7)$$

Furthermore, if we denote by  $T^*$  the supremum of all  $T > 0$  such that the above assertion holds, then either  $T^* = \infty$  or  $T^* < \infty$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{either} \quad & \limsup_{t \rightarrow T^*-0} \|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{[\frac{n}{2}]+1,2} = \infty, \\ \text{or} \quad & \limsup_{t \rightarrow -T^*+0} \|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{[\frac{n}{2}]+1,2} = \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

**Proof.** Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\varphi_0 \neq 0$ ; if  $\varphi_0 = 0$  then clearly  $\varphi = 0$  solves the problem. For given integer  $k > \frac{n}{2}$  and real  $T > 0$ , we denote by  $X_T$  the Banach space  $C([-T, T]; H^k(R^n))$  (with norm  $\|\varphi\| = \sup_{|t| \leq T} \|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{k,2}$ ). Let  $\mathcal{F}: X_T \rightarrow X_T$  be the operator defined by

$$(\mathcal{F}\varphi)(\cdot, t) = W(t)\varphi_0 + i \int_0^t W(t-s)f(|\varphi(\cdot, s)|^2)\varphi(\cdot, s)ds.$$

By (2.1) and (2.6), it is clear that  $\mathcal{F}$  is well defined. Actually, using (2.1), (2.2) and (2.6) and a standard argument, we can easily prove that  $\mathcal{F}$  maps the closed ball in  $X_T$

$$B_{M,T} = \{\varphi \in X_T : \|\varphi\| \leq M\}, \quad M = 2\|\varphi_0\|_{k,2},$$

into itself and is a contraction mapping on this ball provided  $T$  is sufficiently small (say,  $T < \min\{(2M\omega_1(M))^{-1}, (2\omega_2(2M))^{-1}\}$ ). Hence, by the Banach fixed point theorem we see that  $\mathcal{F}$  has a unique fixed point on  $B_{M,T}$  for small  $T$ , which is clearly the unique solution of the initial value problem of (1.1) in the class  $C([-T, T]; H^k(R^n))$ . From (1.1) we see that also  $\varphi \in C^1([-T, T]; H^{k-4}(R^n))$ .

In the remainder we assume that  $T^* < \infty$  and prove (2.8). Consider first the case  $k = [\frac{n}{2}] + 1$ . If (2.8) does not hold then there is  $M > 0$  such that

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{k,2} \leq M \quad \text{for } -T^* < t < T^*.$$

By an argument similar to that used before, we can deduce that there exists a constant  $\delta > 0$  depending only on  $M$ , such that for each  $t_0 \in (-T^*, T^*)$  Eq. (1.1) has a unique solution on  $R^n \times [t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]$  such that its value at  $t_0$  is  $\varphi(\cdot, t_0)$  and it belongs to

$$C([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]; H^k(R^n)) \bigcap C^1([t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta]; H^{k-4}(R^n)).$$

By uniqueness, all these solutions are mutually equal on their common domains. It follows that we can paste these solutions together to get a solution on the domain  $R^n \times (-T^* - \delta, T^* + \delta)$ , such that for any  $0 < T < T^* + \delta$  it belongs to the class (2.7), which contradicts the definition of  $T^*$ . Consider next the case  $k > [\frac{n}{2}] + 1$ . Let  $k_0 = [\frac{n}{2}] + 1$ . If (2.8) does not hold then there is  $M_0 > 0$  such that

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{k_0, 2} \leq M_0 \quad \text{for } -T^* < t < T^*.$$

By (2.3) and (2.6) we have, for any  $t \in (-T^*, T^*)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{k_0+1, 2} &\leq \|\varphi_0\|_{k_0+1, 2} + \left| \int_0^t \omega_3(\|\varphi(\cdot, s)\|_{k_0, 2}) \|\varphi(\cdot, s)\|_{k_0+1, 2} ds \right| \\ &\leq \|\varphi_0\|_{k_0+1, 2} + \omega_3(M_0) \left| \int_0^t \|\varphi(\cdot, s)\|_{k_0+1, 2} ds \right|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Gronwall inequality that

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{k_0+1, 2} \leq \|\varphi_0\|_{k_0+1, 2} e^{\omega_3(M_0)|t|} \leq \|\varphi_0\|_{k_0+1, 2} e^{\omega_3(M_0)T^*} \equiv M_1$$

for  $t \in (-T^*, T^*)$ . Repeating this argument we finally get, by induction, that

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{k, 2} \leq \|\varphi_0\|_{k, 2} e^{\omega_3(M_{p-1})T^*} \equiv M_p$$

for  $t \in (-T^*, T^*)$  ( $p = k - k_0$ ). Hence  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{k, 2}$  is bounded for  $t \in (-T^*, T^*)$ . Using an argument similar to that for the case  $k = k_0$ , we can then deduce that the solution can be extended to a larger domain  $R^n \times (-T^* - \delta, T^* + \delta)$  for some  $\delta > 0$ , such that it belongs to the class (2.7) for any  $0 < T < T^* + \delta$ , which contradicts the definition of  $T^*$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

By the second assertion of Theorem 2.2, it follows that if for any  $T > 0$  we can get an a priori estimate  $\sup_{|t| < T} \|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{k_0, 2} \leq C(T)(k_0 = [\frac{n}{2}] + 1)$  for the solution of Eq. (1.1), then the solution exists for all  $(x, t) \in R^n \times R$ .

### 3. Global existence of solutions

**Lemma 3.1.** Let  $F(s) = \int_0^s f(s') ds'$  and let  $\varphi$  be the solution of (1.1) on  $R^n \times (-T, T)$ . Assume that  $f$  is continuous and for some integer  $k$ ,  $k \geq 2$  and  $k > \frac{n}{2}$ ,

$$\varphi \in C((-T, T); H^k(R^n)) \bigcap C^1((-T, T); H^{k-4}(R^n)).$$

Then for any  $|t| < T$ ,

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_2^2 = \|\varphi_0\|_2^2 \equiv E_0, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_2^2 - \frac{\lambda}{\mu} \|\nabla\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{R^n} F(|\varphi(\cdot, s)|^2) dx \\ = \|\Delta\varphi_0\|_2^2 - \frac{\lambda}{\mu} \|\nabla\varphi_0\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{R^n} F(|\varphi_0|^2) dx \equiv E_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

**Proof.** We first note that  $\varphi \in C((-T, T); (C \cap L^\infty)(R^n))$ , by the assumption on  $k$  and  $\varphi$ . Thus all terms in (3.2) make sense. Multiplying (1.1) by  $\bar{\varphi}$ , integrating over  $R^n$  and then taking imaginary parts we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{R^n} |\varphi(x, t)|^2 dx = 0.$$

Hence (3.1) holds. Next, multiplying (1.1) by  $\overline{\varphi_t}$ , integrating over  $R^n$  and taking real parts, we obtain

$$-\lambda \frac{d}{dt} \int_{R^n} |\nabla \varphi(x, t)|^2 dx + \mu \frac{d}{dt} \int_{R^n} |\Delta \varphi(x, t)|^2 dx + \frac{d}{dt} \int_{R^n} F(|\varphi(x, t)|^2) dx = 0.$$

Hence we have (3.2).  $\square$

In the remainder we always assume that  $n = 1, 2, 3$ . Note that under this assumption the condition  $k \geq 2$  implies that  $k > \frac{n}{2}$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** Suppose the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Then for any  $\varphi_0 \in H^k(R^n)$  we have, for  $t$  in any existence interval of the solution  $\varphi$ ,

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq \omega(\|\varphi_0\|_{2,2}), \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\omega(\|\varphi_0\|_{2,2})$  represents a constant depending only on  $\|\varphi_0\|_{2,2}$ .

**Proof.** By the Agmon–Douglas–Nirenberg inequality we have

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq C(\|\Delta \varphi(\cdot, t)\|_2 + \|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_2).$$

It follows from (3.2) and (3.1) that

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq -\frac{C}{\mu} \int_{R^n} F(|\varphi(x, t)|^2) dx + C\|\nabla \varphi(\cdot, t)\|_2^2 + CE_0 + CE_1. \quad (3.4)$$

By the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality and the Cauchy inequality we have, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\|\nabla \varphi\|_2 \leq C\|\varphi\|_{2,2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon\|\varphi\|_{2,2} + C(\varepsilon)\|\varphi\|_2.$$

Substituting this estimate into (3.4), using (3.1) and taking  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small, we obtain

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2}^2 \leq -\frac{C}{\mu} \int_{R^n} F(|\varphi(x, t)|^2) dx + CE_0 + CE_1.$$

By (1.4) we have  $-\mu^{-1}F(s^2) \leq Cs^{2(\sigma+1)} + Cs^2$ . Hence

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2}^2 \leq C\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2(\sigma+1)}^{2(\sigma+1)} + CE_0 + CE_1. \quad (3.5)$$

Since  $\sigma < \frac{4}{n}$ , by the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality and the Young inequality we have, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_{2(\sigma+1)}^{2(\sigma+1)} &\leq C\|\varphi\|_{2,2}^{\frac{n\sigma}{2}}\|\varphi\|_2^{2(\sigma+1)-\frac{n\sigma}{2}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon\|\varphi\|_{2,2}^2 + C(\varepsilon)\|\varphi\|_2^{2+8\sigma/(4-n\sigma)} \leq \varepsilon\|\varphi\|_{2,2}^2 + C(\varepsilon)E_0^{1+4\sigma/(4-n\sigma)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Substituting (3.6) into (3.5) and taking  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small, we obtain

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2}^2 \leq CE_0^{1+4\sigma/(4-n\sigma)} + CE_0 + CE_1 \leq \omega(\|\varphi_0\|_{2,2}).$$

Hence (3.3) holds.  $\square$

By Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 2.2, we see that Theorem 1.1 follows.

**Lemma 3.3.** Suppose the conditions of Theorem 1.2 are satisfied. Then there exist constants  $c^* > 0$  and  $C > 0$  such that for any  $\varphi_0 \in H^k(R^n)$  satisfying  $\|\varphi_0\|_{2,2} \leq c^*$ , we have  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq C$  for any  $t$  in the existence interval of  $\varphi$ .

**Proof.** We split the proof into four steps.

*Step1:* Clearly  $f(s)$  is a continuous function, so there is a constant  $c_0 > 0$  such that

$$|F(s)| \leq c_0 s \quad \text{for } |s| \leq 1. \quad (3.7)$$

We first prove that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $\varphi_0$  and  $T$  such that if

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_\infty \leq 1 \quad \text{for } |t| < T, \quad (3.8)$$

then

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq C \|\varphi_0\|_{2,2} \quad \text{for } |t| < T. \quad (3.9)$$

Indeed, by an argument similar to that in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we get from (3.2) and (3.1) that

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2}^2 \leq C \int_{R^n} |F(|\varphi(x, t)|^2)| dx + C E_0 + C E_1,$$

where  $E_0$  and  $E_1$  are as in (3.1) and (3.2). Thus if (3.8) holds then by (3.7) and (3.1) we have

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2}^2 \leq C \int_{R^n} |\varphi(x, t)|^2 dx + C E_0 + C E_1 \leq C E_0 + C E_1.$$

Clearly  $E_0 \leq \|\varphi_0\|_{2,2}^2$ . Since (3.8) implies that  $\|\varphi_0\|_\infty \leq 1$ , we have also  $E_1 \leq C \|\varphi_0\|_{2,2}^2$ . Hence (3.9) follows.

*Step 2:* We prove that for any  $M > 0$  there exists a corresponding constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that if  $\|\varphi_0\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$  and  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq M$  for  $|t| < T$ , then (3.9) holds.

Indeed, by the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality and (3.1) we have

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_\infty \leq C \|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_2^{1-\frac{n}{4}} \|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2}^{\frac{n}{4}} \leq C \|\varphi_0\|_2^{1-\frac{n}{4}} \|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2}^{\frac{n}{4}} \leq C M^{\frac{n}{4}} \|\varphi_0\|_2^{1-\frac{n}{4}}.$$

It follows that if  $C M^{\frac{n}{4}} \|\varphi_0\|_2^{1-\frac{n}{4}} \leq 1$ , then (3.8) holds, and the desired assertion follows from the assertion obtained in Step 1.

*Step 3:* We prove that for any given  $M_0 > 0$  there exist corresponding constants  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that if  $\|\varphi_0\|_{2,2} \leq M_0$  and  $\|\varphi_0\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ , then for any  $T > 0$  we have

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq C M_0 \quad \text{for } |t| < T. \quad (3.10)$$

To prove this assertion we write  $M = C M_0 + 1$ , where  $C$  is the constant in (3.9). Let  $\varepsilon$  be the small constant obtained in Step 2 when  $M$  is given in this way. It follows from the result of Step 2 that if  $\|\varphi_0\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$  and  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq M$ , for  $|t| < T_0$  for some  $0 < T_0 \leq T$ , then  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq C M_0$  for  $|t| < T_0$ . Since clearly  $C \geq 1$ , we have  $M > M_0$ . Hence, by continuity, the condition  $\|\varphi_0\|_{2,2} \leq M_0$  implies that there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq M$  for all  $|t| \leq \delta$ . Denoting by  $T^*$  the supremum of all such  $\delta$ , we can conclude that  $T^* = T$ . Indeed, since  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq M$  for all  $|t| < T^*$ , we have  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq C M_0$  for  $|t| < T^*$ . If  $T^* < T$  then by continuity we must have  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} \leq C M_0 < M$  for  $|t| = T^*$ . It follows again by continuity that  $\|\varphi(\cdot, t)\|_{2,2} < M$  for  $|t| < T^* + \delta$ , for some  $\delta > 0$ , which contradicts the definition of  $T^*$ . Hence  $T^* = T$ , and (3.10) follows.

*Step 4:* We now take  $M_0 = 1$ , and let  $\varepsilon$  be the small number obtained in Step 3. Then, by taking  $c^* = \min\{1, \varepsilon\}$ , we readily see that the desired assertion follows. This completes the proof.  $\square$

By Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 2.2, we see that Theorem 1.2 follows.

## Acknowledgements

The authors are greatly indebted to the anonymous referees for their valuable suggestions for modifying the manuscript.

## References

- [1] B.A. Ivanov, A.M. Kosevich, Stable three-dimensional small-amplitude soliton in magnetic materials, *Sov. J. Low Temp. Phys.* 9 (1983) 439–442.
- [2] S.K. Turitsyn, Three-dimensional dispersion of nonlinearity and stability of multidimensional solitons, *Teoret. Mat. Fiz.* 64 (1985) 226–232 (in Russian).
- [3] V.I. Karpman, A.G. Shagalov, Stability of solitons described by nonlinear Schrodinger type equation with higher-order dispersion, *Phys. D* 144 (2000) 194–210.
- [4] G. Fibich, B. Ilan, G. Papanicolaou, Self-focusing with fourth-order dispersion, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 62 (2002) 1437–1462.
- [5] S. Mizohata, *Theory of Partial Differential Equations*, Iwanami, Tokyo, 1965 (in Japanese).